view of U.S. Patent 5,625,764 to Tsujimoto et al. (hereafter Tsujimoto). The rejections are

respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a first video processing part, a second video processing part,

a control part, an adjusting part (wherein a given number of bits of the video signal from the

second video processing part are selected and presented in order of significance level thereof),

and a switching part. Independent claim 1 also recites the switching part for superimposing the

video signal from the first video processing part and the video signal from the adjusting part

according to the control signal from the control part, <u>by adding bits of the video signal from the</u>

<u>first video processing part in reverse order of significance level thereof with the video signal bits</u>

<u>presented from the adjusting part.</u>

The Office Action (on page 5) states that Rainville does not disclose the claimed wherein

a given number of bits of the video signal from the second video processing part are selected

and presented in order of significance level thereof, and (superimposing the video signal) by

adding bits of the video signal from the first video processing part in reverse order of

significance level thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part. The Office

Action (on page 5) then cites Jenison's FIG. 1 and col. 1, line 56-col. 3, line 38 for these features

of independent claim 1 missing from Rainville. However, Jenison merely discloses using a digital

control word to select one of the two same significant bits of two video input signals. These

features do not correspond to the missing features.

The present specification relates to selecting a first bit between a Most Significant Bit

from a first video signal part and a Least Significant Bit from a second video signal part, a

2

second bit between a second Most Significant Bit from the first video signal part and a second

Least Significant Bit from the second video part,..., and a last bit between the Least Significant

Bit from the first video signal part and the Most Significant Bit from the second video signal

part. Although the Most Significant Bit from the first video signal part is selected, the Most

Significant Bit from the second video signal part can also be selected.

On the other hand, Jenison selects a first bit (half of the total current) between a Most

Significant Bit from a first video and a Most Significant Bit from a second video, a second bit

(quarter of the total current) between a second Most Significant Bit from the first video and a

second Most Significant Bit from the second video,...and a last bit (8th bit, 25th of total current)

between a Least Significant Bit from the first video and a Least Significant Bit from the second

video. Thus, Jenison does not add bits in a reverse order of significance level. Additionally, if the

Most Significant Bit from the first video is selected, the Most Significant Bit from the second

video is not simultaneously selected in Jenison.

Further, the Office Action (on page 3) appears to state that by controlling the control

word (in Jenison), then either video signals A and B would be output in the reverse order of

significance level thereof. However, independent claim 1 relates to bits of a video signal being in

order of a significance level (e.g. MSB and LSB). The Office Action appears to state that the

video signals could be applied in a reverse order of significance (such as Video B before Video

A). However, this interpretation is improper and does not correspond to the claimed features of

adding bits in reverse order of significance level. Jenison's col. 2, line 67-col. 3, line 9 does not

correspond to adding bits in a reverse order of significance.

3

For at least the reasons set forth above, Jenison does not teach or suggest a switching part by <u>adding bits</u> of the video signal from the first video processing part <u>in reverse order of significance level</u> thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part, as recited in independent claim 1. Rainville and Jenison therefore do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 7 recites <u>adding bits</u> of a video signal of the main picture <u>in reverse order of significance level thereof</u> with bits of a video signal of the PIP selected and presented <u>in order of significance level</u> thereof according to the adjusted mix ratio. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Rainville and Jenison do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 7. Thus, independent claim 7 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 11 recites outputting a given number of data bits among the sub picture data according to a user command in order of significance level thereof, and superimposing the outputted sub picture data bits on the main picture data, wherein the outputted sub picture data bits are <u>added to bits of the main picture data in reverse order of significance of the main picture data bits during the superimposing</u>. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Rainville and Jenison do not teach or suggest at least the features of independent claim 11. Thus, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 17 recites an output unit coupled to the controller for outputting a given number of data bits among the sub picture data in order of significance level thereof in response to the control signal, and a switching unit coupled to the output unit for superimposing the outputted sub picture data bits on the main picture data, wherein the switching unit

superimposes the outputted sub picture data bits on the main picture data <u>by adding the outputted sub picture data bits with bits of the main picture data in reverse order of significance of the main picture data bits</u>.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Rainville and Jenison do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 17. Thus, independent claim 17 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 7, 11 and 17 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK:DCO/kah
Date: February 28, 2007
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610